Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached four (4) sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 3, 4, 5, and 6. These sheets, which includes Figs. 3, 4, 5, and 6, replace the original sheets including Figs. 3, 4, 5, and 6.

In Fig. 3, for item 301, the label has been deleted.

In Fig. 4, for item 403, the label has been moved so that the label does not overlay the line of the figure.

In Fig. 5, for item 503, the label has been moved so that the label does not overlay the line of the figure.

In Fig. 6, for items 653, 655, 657, 659, 670, 672, the labels have been deleted.

Attachment: Four Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Drawings

Fig. 4 is objected to because item 403 in Fig. 4 has a label that overlays the line of the figure. Fig. 4 has been amended such that the label for item 403 has been moved so that the label no longer overlays the line of the figure.

Fig. 5 is objected to because item 503 in Fig. 5 has a label that overlays the line of the figure. Fig. 5 has been amended such that the label for item 503 has been moved so that the label no longer overlays the line of the figure.

Figs. 4 and 5 have been redrawn such that the items have been repositioned to better comply with MPEP drawing requirements.

Figs. 3, 5, and 6 is objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5). Figs. 3 and 6 have been amended. Specifically, the label for item 301 in Fig. 3 has been deleted. The labels for items 653, 655, 657, 659, 670, 672 in Fig. 6 have been deleted. With respect to Fig. 5, the specification has been amended to include reference to item 509.

Specification

The paragraph on page 12, starting on line 19 and ending on line 32 has been amended to include a reference to item 509 in Fig. 5 to bring Fig. 5 in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5).

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements. For ease of prosecution, claim 15 has been amended to include the following limitation as suggested by the Examiner: means for receiving the encrypted Common Transport Information Unit from the second network entity.

The Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 15 is now in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-8, 10, and 12-19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being un-patentable over claims 26-30, 36, 37, 40, 42, 43, and 48-50 of co-pending Application No. 10/034,367. Accordingly, a terminal disclaimer is submitted with this paper to overcome this provisional rejection.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3-7, 9-13, and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by NCITS, "Fibre Channel Generic Services – 3, Rev. 7.01," November, 2000 (hereinafter "NCITS").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." (Please see MPEP 2131.)

With respect to independent claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that NCITS does not teach at least the following limitation recited in claim 1: "decrypting at least a first portion of the Common Transport Information Unit by using algorithm information contained in the entry in the security database."

The outstanding Office Action indicates that NCITS, at section 9.1.2, discloses a security database, "which contain security information, including key information, for each client, including the source and destination." Sections 9.1.2 and 9.1.2.1-9.1.2.3 of NCITS disclose a key database. Specifically, the Key Server contains a distribution database for each Client, including entries shown in table 258, such as distribution_encryption_id, client_name, and distribution_key. This database is the client distribution *key* database. Sections 9.1.2 and 9.1.2.1-9.1.2.3 of NCITS do not indicate that the key database contains any information relating to encryption and/or decryption algorithms used to encrypt and/or decrypt the Common Transport Information Unit.

In contrast, the security database described in the presently claimed invention contains information relating to encryption and/or decryption algorithms used to encrypt and/or decrypt the Common Transport Information Unit. A key is not an encryption/decryption algorithm, but merely a variable used by the encryption/decryption algorithm. The present specification differentiates between information relating to the encryption/decryption algorithm (see page 10 lines 9-11) and key information (see page 10 lines 8-9). Therefore, the claimed security database is not the same as the key database described in NCITS. Consequently, NCITS does not disclose the above-recited limitation in claim 1.

Similarly, with respect to independent claim 7, NCITS does not teach at least the following limitation recited in claim 7: "encrypting a first portion of the Common Transport Information Unit using key and algorithm information associated with the entry in the security database." With respect to independent claim 13, NCITS does not teach at least the following limitation recited in claim 13: "means for encrypting a portion of the Common Transport Information Unit using key and algorithm information associated with the entry in

the security database." With respect to independent claim 15, NCITS does not teach at least the following limitation recited in amended claim 15: "means for decrypting an encrypted Common Transport Information Unit using key and algorithm information in the security database." With respect to independent claim 16, NCITS does not teach at least the following limitation recited in claim 16: "decrypt at least a first portion of the Common Transport Information Unit by using algorithm information contained in the entry in the security database." With respect to independent claim 17, NCITS does not teach at least the following limitation recited in claim 17: "encrypt at least a first portion of the Common Transport Information Unit by using algorithm information contained in the entry in the security database." With respect to independent claim 18, NCITS does not teach at least the following limitation recited in claim 18: "decrypt at least a first portion of the Common Transport Information Unit by using algorithm information contained in the entry in the security database." With respect to independent claim 19, NCITS does not teach at least the following limitation recited in claim 19: "encrypt at least a first portion of the Common Transport Information Unit by using algorithm information contained in the entry in the security database." As explained above, the key database disclosed in NCITS does not contain any information relating to encryption and/or decryption algorithms used to encrypt and/or decrypt the Common Transport Information Unit.

Dependent claims 3-6 and 9-12 directly or indirectly depend from claims 1 and 7 respectively and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Further, these dependent claims recite additional limitations that when considered in the context of the claimed invention further patentably distinguish the art of record.

For example, claim 5 recites the limitation of "using algorithm information contained in the entry in the security database to authenticate the payload of the Common Transport Information Unit." Since NCITS does not disclose a database containing the encryption/decryption algorithm information, NCITS consequently does not disclose using any encryption/decryption algorithm contained in the security database for authenticating the payload of the Common Transport Information Unit. Therefore, NCITS does not disclose the above-recited limitation in claim 5.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 8, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being un-patentable over NCITS in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,061,794 to Angelo (hereinafter "Angelo").

One criteria required for establishing a prima facie case of obviousness is that "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." (Please see MPEP 2143.)

As explained above, NCITS does not disclose at least the limitation of "decrypting at least a first portion of the Common Transport Information Unit by using algorithm information contained in the entry in the security database" recited in claim 1, the limitation of "encrypt at least a first portion of the Common Transport Information Unit by using algorithm information contained in the entry in the security database" recited in claim 7, and the limitation of "means for encrypting a portion of the Common Transport Information Unit using key and algorithm information associated with the entry in the security database" recited in claim 13. Angelo does not disclose these limitations either.

Dependent claims 2, 8, and 14 directly or indirectly depend from claims 1, 7, and 13 respectively and are therefore respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Further, these dependent claims recite additional limitations that when considered in the context of the claimed invention further patentably distinguish the art of record.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in proper form and are in condition for allowance, and request a Notification of Allowance to that effect. It is believed that no fee is due at this time. Should any fee be required for any reason related to this document, however, then the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge said fee to Deposit Account No. 50-0388, referencing Docket No. ANDIP041. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below with any questions or concerns relating to this document or application.

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Marc S. Hanish/

Marc S. Hanish

Reg. No. 42,626

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(408) 255-8001